DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 368 SO 019 696

AUTHOR Hutton, Deborah S.
TITLE US/USSR Textbook Study Project: Methodological Aspects.
PUB DATE 9 Apr 88
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, New Orleans, LA, April 4-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Content Analysis; Geography Instruction; History Textbooks; International Educational Exchange; Modern History; Social Studies; *Textbooks; *United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Soviet History; USSR; *US USSR Textbook Survey Proj

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the joint cooperation between the United States and the USSR for a bilateral textbook review project that was begun in the 1970s. The US/USSR Textbook Study Project, suspended in 1980 when President Jimmy Carter ended U.S. cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union after the Afghanistan invasion, resumed in 1986 with different expert participants and has yet to be completed. Twenty-five U.S. textbooks and eight Soviet textbooks were chosen, translated, and exchanged for review. Four guidelines were established to guide the project: (1) only history and geography textbooks would be studied; (2) textbook coverage would be restricted to US-USSR relations; (3) the reviews would have a limited distribution; and (4) criticisms would be freely provided and would be used as recommendations for textbook updates. The advantages of bilateral textbook study, while fewer than the disadvantages, are considered more powerful and include: (1) the active involvement of a significant number of people and organizations; (2) the cultural exchange resulting from the official meetings in the United States and the Soviet Union; and (3) the openmindedness that came from the verbal and written interaction between the two countries' professionals. Some of the disadvantages for bilateral textbook study include the unguided judgment of the experts, the restrictions, and the constant turnover of textbook use. The appendices contain a list of the U.S. and Soviet participants and a list of the textbook titles. Two references are included. (DJC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304368

US/USSR TEXTBOOK STUDY PROJECT: METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Deborah S. Hutton
Research Associate
Social Studies Development Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

AERA Annual Meeting
New Orleans, LA
9 April 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DEBORAH S. HUTTON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This presentation is being supported by a Mellon Graduate Student Grant-in-Aid of Research, granted by the Russian and East European Institute and by the Laboratory for Educational Development, both located at Indiana University.

50 017 696

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. Introduction

A cooperative, bilateral textbook study is a multifaceted effort operating in an arena of ever expanding complexity. This paper outlines the methodology involved in one such study--the US/USSR Textbook Study Project, directed by Howard Mehlinger, Dean of the School of Education of Indiana University, from 1977 to the present.

Considerable resources must be brought to bear to assure the successful outcome of the study. By far the most important resource is the group of experts which reviews the textbooks of each country. These experts must be identified in the first place and, in the second place, must be available to do the reviews and participate in project meetings. The next two vital resources lead naturally from the experts - money and time. Neither is necessarily abundant, nor easily acquired. The availability of money depends not only upon someone's fundraising skills, but upon the political and academic climates with respect to the other country or region to be involved in the study. Finding the funds to support a bilateral study with a country out of favor with the current people in government, the general population, or academe, however crucial to improved international understanding, can prove to be challenging. Some money is required for tasks without visible products, such as meetings and travel, thus providing a further deterrent to fundraising. Then there is the issue of time. It is difficult to calculate when working with so many uncontrollable factors - translations of unknown length, international communications in two languages, intervening politics, different bureaucracies, and different cultural norms. Finally, textbooks, reliable translators, and a basic support staff are required resources without which such a bilateral study could not function. The picture of such a study becomes one of multi-

facets, loose structure, flexible timetable, minimal and barely defined rules of operation, language differences, and assorted other uncontrollable factors - a formidable task!

Perhaps it looks too formidable, but think of the main goal of the project. If it is simply to examine textbooks (which is certainly a useful task, in and of itself), then this methodology probably is not appropriate. If, however, your goal is to maximize the possibility of real change in textbook content and perspective, then this methodology just might be worth all of the effort and resources, because the key strength of this methodology is the process.

The process involves the people who produce and use the textbooks of two countries in extensive and sometimes intensive interaction. They criticize each other's textbooks, defend their own, make scholastic presentations to each other, correspond with cables, meet in person, travel to and through the other's country, exchange business cards and stories of grandchildren. People don't change by being told to do so; they change through a process in which they become engaged, whatever the motivation. This methodology can provide that process, so that at least some of the study teams' members can move to a place, beyond old stereotypes, where they can really hear some of the criticisms and recommendations of the other team and include some of them in new textbooks.

In the Interim Report (1981, p. 171) of the US/USSR Textbook Study Project, the concluding chapter begins with a quote by Goethe: "'The question is not whether we are perfectly agreed, but whether we are proceeding from a common basis of sentiment.'" That "common basis of sentiment" can be fostered by the process of a cooperative, bilateral textbook study.

II. Chronology

The US/USSR Textbook Study Project has not been a simple, straightforward enterprise which began one year, followed precise steps, and ended another year. Rather, it has, so far, involved three separate phases, what will be referred to here (to simplify the chronology) as the Initial Phase, the Interim Phase, and the Continuation Phase. The original plan involved only the Initial Phase. Political events, however, dictated otherwise, as will be discussed later on.

What follows here is a chronology of the events of this project. This exercise serves two purposes, the first of which is to indicate the variety of activities and the copious time which can be involved in a bilateral textbook study. The second is to illustrate clearly just how complicated such a study can be, to examine the complexity of the whole.

Initial Phase. The idea for a US/USSR bilateral textbook study first surfaced during a visit by the then U.S. Secretary of State John Richardson to the USSR Ministry of Education in May, 1975. Almost a whole year later, in March, 1976, the USSR Ministry responded by sending a set of Soviet textbooks and a proposal to the U.S. State Department. On October 22, 1976, the study was formally authorized in Washington, D.C., by the "Program of Exchanges between the USA and the USSR for 1977-79."

To prepare for the study, small delegations from each country exchanged visits. In December, 1977, four Americans spent two weeks in the USSR, discussing the project and getting a feel for the educational context of Soviet texts by visiting schools and meeting with historians, geographers, and pedagogical specialists. Three Soviets returned the exchange in February, 1978. For two weeks, they, too, met people and visited places in order to understand the context of American textbook writing, publication,

and adoption. This exchange process was vital to the process of seeking common goals and procedures to be followed.

For the next year, each team worked independently. The American team had its first meeting in June, 1978. The advisors and reviewers met to agree upon policies and procedures to be followed in the textbook review process. The reviewers worked through the Summer and Fall of 1978, critiquing both American and Soviet texts, and met in January, 1979 to compile their results.

Three Americans met with members of the Soviet Textbook Commission in late February, early March, 1979. The Americans provided individual critiques for each Soviet text, while the Soviets offered, at the meeting, a general essay on major findings. They later sent their individual text reviews through the mail. The exchange of reviews included a lively debate regarding the findings. Another major purpose of this meeting was to plan the procedures and issues for the upcoming conference (the first of two) between all members of both teams.

In June, 1979, both teams met for two weeks in Moscow to discuss the findings of the textbook reviews and to present ten significant historical and geographical topics (these are listed in section V. "Methodological Details"). They also decided on the organizational details of the joint, final report, different sections to be contributed by one side or the other, and to hold the second all-member conference in the US no later than March, 1980, for the purpose of finalizing the text of the final report. During the second week (of the 1979 meeting), the American team was split into three, each group visiting schools, universities, and ministries of education in either Moscow, Leningrad-Kiev, or Tashkent-Samarkand.

Preliminary drafts of the final report were exchanged in January/February, 1980, and plans begun for the March meeting; however, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December, 1979, affected the project plans considerably. In retaliation, along with other measures, the Carter Administration severed all forms of cultural exchange with the USSR, including this project, making the March meeting impossible. This, then, was the end of the Initial Phase.

Interim Phase. A period of relative inactivity followed, which is referred to here as the Interim Phase. Communicating only by correspondence, the two teams could not agree upon how to produce a final report without a final collaborative conference. Eventually, in the Spring of 1981, the director of the American team informed the liaison in the USSR Ministry of Education that the American team planned to publish its own Interim Report, based upon the preliminary final report drafts which had been previously exchanged. The Interim Report was not published for wide, public distribution, but did provide a means of tentative reporting of progress and findings to American sponsors and funding bodies. For a long while, the report was the only project activity. It was unplanned and unforeseen by project members that the interim phase would last for six years.

Continuation Phase. The US/USSR Textbook Project resumed its activities again in Geneva, Switzerland in November, 1985. There, General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan signed an agreement renewing cultural ties and exchanges between the two countries at all levels, including textbooks, specifically. Then in May, 1986, the American team director flew to Moscow to meet with the USSR Ministry of Education to agree on procedures for restarting the project.

The challenge was not a minor one. New funding had to be solicitted to support the American team and the most recent textbooks had to be acquired since the textbooks of both nations had been revised or replaced in the intervening years. It was clear that simply having one last conference and publishing a final report were no longer sufficient. Parts of the initial phase had to be replicated with the newer textbooks before any conclusions could viably be drawn.

For the American team, the process this time around was much simpler. The Fall, 1986, was largely spent acquiring and selecting 25 recent American textbooks to exchange with the eight new Soviet texts, waiting for the exchange to be complete, and having the relevant Soviet passages translated into English (methodological details will be outlined in section V.). The review process itself, involving only the Soviet texts, took place through the Spring, 1987.

A small combined US/USSR delegation meeting was planned for June, 1987, in the US, during which textbook reviews would be exchanged and a major team conference would be planned (to take place in the US, as was originally planned for March, 1980). This meeting did not take place. Instead the reviews and tentative conference plans were exchanged by mail and cable through the Summer and Fall, 1987.

Finally, in November, 1987, the team from the USSR met the US team for a week at Wingspread, in Racine, Wisconsin. This conference included the response to and defense of both sets of textbook reviews, the exchange of recent historical and geographical scholarship, an agreement that each team would produce their own form of a final report, and plans for future projects. Following this meeting, four of the Soviet delegates travelled

while five of them were guests of and made the major panel presentation to the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) Annual Meeting in Dallas, Texas.

The project, however, is still not finished! The Soviet reviews of the ten American history textbooks have not yet been received. As of late Winter, 1988, the USSR Ministry of Education has been closed, so that it really is not predictable when the project will reach its final conclusion.

It must be clear by now that a bilateral textbook study can be complicated and lengthy. Others, such as the US/Japan and US/Netherlands Textbook Study Projects, can take as few as two to four years. Nonetheless, all of them are subject to, among other factors, the convolutions of time, translations, cross-cultural protocol, and politics. As daunting as these limitations may at first appear, there are subtle benefits in each of them. These will be addressed in section VI., "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Bilateral Textbook Study."

III. Support

Two kinds of support have been essential to this project: sponsors and funds. Sponsors are vital to provide credibility, expert input, and channels through which to disseminate study results. The Soviet team was sponsored solely by the Ministry of Education. The American team was sponsored by four professional or trade associations: the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), the Association of American Publishers (AAP), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the NCSS.

Because a bilateral team project can be complicated and costly, funds, too, are vital to the successful completion of a textbook study. Again, the Soviet team was originally solely funded by the Ministry of Education. Their November, 1987, trip to the US was funded by the United States Information Agency (USIA). In the initial phase, the American team was financially supported by the International Communication Agency, the Ford Foundation, the William and Mary Greve Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In the recent continuation of the project, financial support has been provided by the Danforth Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Johnson Foundation, the William and Mary Greve Foundation, the New York Times Company Foundation, and the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation.

By agreement, each side paid its own operating expenses. When international meetings were required, each side paid its own international air travel; the host side assumed responsibility for all expenses while the visitors were in the host country.

IV. Guiding Principles

Following the initial exchange of visits and consultations, in the Winter of 1977-78, the two sides agreed to a number of principles to guide the project. They are listed below:

1. The study would focus on history and geography textbooks in the two countries. These two disciplines were held in common, allowing for a reasonable comparison of textbooks and overshadowing differences in curriculum organization, course grades, course sequencing, and internal course structure. In the USSR, history and geography are

explicitly taught, while in the US, history and geography are taught as part of the social studies.

2. The study would focus upon the information each textbook contained about the other country and about the relationships between the two countries. Thus, the American experts focused their attention on the information which Soviet textbooks provided about the United States and US-Soviet relations, while Soviet experts concentrated on the information contained in American texts about the Soviet Union and US-Soviet relations.

3. The distribution of individual textbook reviews would be limited to project participants and to respective authors and publishers of the textbooks. No effort would be made to disseminate broadly the reviews of individual textbooks. The final report, containing the general conclusions and textbook recommendations, would be published in English and in Russian and would be distributed widely in both countries. Limiting the distribution of the reviews of individual textbooks to the respective authors and publishers was largely a concession to the Americans. Since only a sample of the American textbooks could be included in the study, there was no apparent advantage to an American publisher to agree to have his/her books reviewed unless the textbook critiques were given restricted circulation. Since publisher cooperation was deemed essential to future willingness to revise textbooks, this seemed to be a small concession. Consistent with this point, it was agreed later that textbooks would not be identified by title, author, or publisher when reporting criticism in the final published report.

Particular books would be identified only by the course or grade level that they were intended to serve.

4. Each national team would be free to criticize the textbooks of the other country in whatever way it judged to be the most appropriate. Each side would take such criticisms into account when preparing recommendations for the improvement of the textbooks in its own country. Thus, the principle was established that the Soviet team would criticize American books and offer recommendations for the improvement of Soviet textbooks. The American team would criticize Soviet textbooks and suggest changes in American textbooks.

These four principles have been followed consistently throughout both active phases of the project, with the exception of the part in number three concerning the final report. As was mentioned in the chronology, a cooperative final report was not possible at the end of the initial stage. At the Wingspread meeting in November, 1987, the Soviet and American teams decided that, at the conclusion of the project, each side will produce its own final report in whatever form it deems best.

V. Methodological Details

The Teams. The Soviet Textbook Commission, in both working phases of the project, was largely made up of the most prominent historians, geographers, and pedagogical experts, at least one of whom was also a textbook author. In the initial phase, the project participant roles were: a single representative of the USSR Ministry of Education, a Commission Chairman, three Commission Vice Presidents, and 18 Commission Members, in

addition to the unremarked contributions of other Soviet scholars and authors.

Representing the Commission at the final conference of the Continuation Phase, held in November, 1987, at Wingspread in Wisconsin, were nine Soviets. Again, they were drawn from among the most prominent scholars available and included a representative of the USSR Ministry of Education. A list of the members of the current Soviet Textbook Commission can be seen in Appendix A.

The American team differed considerably from Initial Phase to Continuation Phase. In the Initial Phase, there were a project director and an associate director, an eight-member advisory committee, and a panel of nine textbook reviewers. The advisory committee was made up of representatives of the four sponsor organizations, while the panel of textbook reviewers was largely made up of recognized scholars who specialized in Soviet history, politics, geography, or education. One was a high school Russian teacher and one an expert in American foreign policy. All but one of these readers could read the Russian text directly. While this, initially, seemed to be an asset, their specialties were not altogether relevant since their charge was to evaluate the coverage of American history and geography (besides US-Soviet relations). Thus, an additional panel of eight specialists in particular topics of American history and geography was drawn together to do the actual content critiques.

In the Continuation Phase, the American team was much smaller due to restricted time and money and a better sense of what expertise would be most useful. It consisted of a director, associate director, and three textbook reviewers. The reviewers this time included only specialists in US-Soviet relations, American history, and American and world geography. The final

conference delegation consisted of the director, one of the reviewers, and others who represented sponsoring organizations or were recognized scholars in Soviet or American history, geography, or education. A list of the members of the US conference team can be seen in Appendix A.

The Textbooks. Choosing comparable textbooks for the two countries was no easy task. First of all, history and geography are taught in the USSR as two separate subjects, whereas in the US, they are mostly integrated into the social studies. Second, in the USSR, there is a national curriculum. This means that the many thousands of Soviet students all use the same textbook for the same subject in the same grade level. In the US, the choice of curricula and textbooks is left to each state and often community; therefore, no choice of textbook will represent all of the US.

A third difference arises from the dissimilar types of curricula. All Soviet students, very simply, are required to take history and geography. American students, on the other hand, are often offered social studies as an elective, which means that what one class is taught as social studies can be entirely different than what is taught another class. Fourth, Soviet students are taught history sequentially. One course will cover a designated period and the next course will cover the next. This means that the texts are likewise sequential and can include considerable detail. American history, however, is taught in a cyclical fashion. In other words, students are taught essentially the same history in each of three years and the corresponding texts all cover the entire US history, with little room for in-depth coverage of anything. Finally, while all Soviet students take geography, not even half of all American students study it after elementary school.

The final criteria for choosing a text became the inclusion in it of information concerning the other country and/or concerning relations between the two countries. The categories and numbers of textbooks for each country remained the same in both Initial and Continuation Phases. The eight Soviet national curriculum textbooks included one each from world history, grades 8, 9 (2 different texts), and 10, "History of the USSR," grades 9 and 10, "Geography of the Continents," grade 6, and "Economic Geography of Foreign Countries," grade 9. Five American textbooks were chosen in each category - world geography, grades 7 and 10, world history, grade 10, and US history, grades 8 and 11. The 25 American textbooks were chosen, not for best scholarship, but for most use across the country. State adoption lists and the Association of American Publishers were both used to guide the choice of books.

In the Continuation Phase, the Soviet textbooks had all of the same titles. Some were simply more recent editions, while a few had been rewritten entirely. The American textbooks were chosen with no consideration for continuity with those used in the Initial Phase, although there turned out to be some overlap. This was because so many textbooks are published each year while, with amazing speed, apparent regulars fall from favor and new books appear. Lists of the Soviet and American textbooks used in the more recent phase can be seen in Appendix B.

The Review Process. In the Initial Phase, the first set of reviewers chosen, as was mentioned previously, was a group of scholars, most of whom read Russian and specialized in a Soviet-related field of study. This did not prove to be entirely useful, since the content which they were to critique dealt largely with American affairs. Thus, a second set of

reviewers had to be identified. These reviewers were recognized experts in American history, American geography, or American-Soviet relations.

These reviewers did not read Russian, so the text material had to be translated. Rather than translate each entire textbook, the decision was made to translate every whole paragraph in which any direct or indirect mention was made of the US. For example, a paragraph in a chapter about Australia could include only a phrase about the export of opals to the US, but the entire paragraph would be translated. A chapter in a history book might be examining France in World War II, yet if there was a mention of the "Allies," then the entire paragraph containing that reference would be translated.

Each text was initially reviewed for ideological bias, adequate coverage of events or issues, balance of treatment, inappropriate terms, factual errors, undue emphasis causing distortion or bias, omission of important details, and out-of-date information. A minimum of three reviewers examined each textbook. The reports regarding each of those books were compiled into a single, comprehensive manuscript by the director. From this reduction process, there emerged only five major categories of criticisms: problems of ideological bias, matters of emphasis, promoting one's own role at the expense of others, factual errors, and inadequate coverage.

In the Initial Phase only, the original American reviewers also examined the American textbooks for their coverage of Soviet events and issues. The purpose of this exercise was to be forearmed (or at least forewarned) regarding the criticisms that the Soviets would have of American textbooks.

Another exercise was part of the review process and, later, the conference (June, 1979) process as well. Each side agreed to develop a series of background papers detailing accepted scholarship regarding some of their own national events or trends. The purpose of these papers was to provide the other team with information which could be useful in preparing recommendations for text revisions. The Soviet topics were:

1. The Great October Socialist Revolution and Its Historical Significance
2. Problems of Economic Regions and Regional Development in the USSR
3. Eastern Front in World War II
4. Soviet Foreign Policy Toward the United States in the 1970's
5. Contemporary Social/Political Development of the USSR (1970's)

The American topics were:

1. The American Revolution and Its Historical Significance
2. Regional Development in the United States
3. War in the Pacific in World War II
4. American Foreign Policy Toward the USSR in the 1970's
5. Contemporary Social/Political Development of the United States (1970's)

In the Continuation Phase (November, 1985, to the present), the review process was much smaller, due to monetary and temporal constraints and to lessons learned during the Initial Phase. The newer set of Soviet textbooks was translated immediately, using the same criterion as before - translate all complete paragraphs containing any direct or indirect reference to the US or Soviet/US relations. The translations, this time, were completed by a group of "junior" level translators (Russian language graduate students). The translations were checked by a "senior" translator. Five pages from the

work of each translator were selected on the basis of the importance of their text content. These were compared to the original text for accuracy.

The review team in this phase consisted of only three people, all national and/or international scholars - one in American history, one in American and world geography, and one in US/Soviet relations. Two of the reviewers each examined two textbooks and one reviewed four textbooks.

Rather than examine the contents of these textbooks in isolation, the reviewers looked for changes from the contents of the textbooks used in the Initial Phase. They wanted to see if the earlier recommendations for change had been acted upon. The reviewers were very specific with their comments, giving page number, paragraph number, and often quoting exact words. They gave reasons for their criticism, often cited reference sources, and provided alternative wording or ideas.

The Soviet and American textbook critiques all had to be exchanged before the November, 1987, meeting in order for them to be translated. Otherwise, there could be no basis for debate regarding each side's criticisms. Again at this conference, current historical and geographical scholarship was exchanged, although not in the form of formal papers.

Overall, there is really only a skeleton of methodology to impart here. So much of the "method" just evolved of necessity. Perhaps the most crucial aspect of it all was the selection of expert reviewers, for the analysis, in the end, rested upon them.

VI. Advantages and Disadvantages of the Bilateral Textbook Study

Advantages. As with all methodologies, this one, too, has its pros and cons. Although fewer in number, the advantages are powerful ones. First of

all, this project involved many people and a considerable number of organizations. This continues to have significant consequences. It broadens the base of ownership and dissemination of the project results and recommendations. Further, it increases the chance for change in US textbooks by involving many of the different parts and people of the textbook publication cycle.

The second advantage is derived from the two major conferences (June, 1979, and November, 1987). The official meetings allowed for discourse regarding controversial topics and put human faces and personalities with the anonymous textbook "reviewers" (what might be termed "scholastic diplomacy"). The travel gave the delegation members of both countries an opportunity to gain a perspective of the textbooks in their respective educational and cultural contexts.

The third advantage is the fact that this methodology is more a human process than a mechanical one. Textbooks are not going to change by themselves. They will be changed by people, and that only after those people themselves have changed. It is through the interaction - verbal and written, personal and professional - between the two project teams that these people will change personally, and then go on to change the contents and perspectives of their textbooks. It is only after changing personally that they will be able to hear the criticisms and recommendations made by the other side.

Disadvantages. The disadvantages are distinctly more numerous and more obvious. The first, and perhaps most striking, is that there really is no transferable methodology other than the larger structure of events. This leads directly to the second major disadvantage, which is the reliance of the project on the unguided judgment of the experts (reviewers). With no

specifically outlined, mechanical methodology, the experts gain alot of power and responsibility. This control gap can be ameliorated by appropriate screening and then briefing of the reviewers.

The next three disadvantages are time, money, and politics. While some similar projects have taken only two to four years from start to finish, this project has been in process since 1977 (the idea, since 1975) - eleven years, and still counting. Sustaining a project over that length of time is not easy, given many factors including the mobility of people, the popular desirability for short-term results, the need of academics to research and publish regularly, the difficulty in sustaining funding, and the vagaries of politics. Acquiring funding, aside from the time element, is difficult in itself. Most humans want to see a return on their investment. What visible return is there from the endless translations of cables or textbook paragraphs? What can be shown a board of directors from the social, or even professional, meetings between the delegations of the two countries? And then there is politics, both national and international. The longer the project, the more likely it is that politics, of some sort, will intervene.

A sixth disadvantage of a bilateral textbook study is that it can be an unwieldy piece of work to orchestrate. There are many people - advisors, experts, translators, staff, state departments, even politicians. There are two cultures, presumably somewhat different in norms of communication and behavior. There is paper galore, but little of it part of a final report. There are endless communications, and miscommunications, all in the pursuit of cooperation between the two teams, concerning almost everything. The resulting project is no little task.

Finally, and this disadvantage may apply to all textbook study methodologies, as soon as there are some results, it's time to start over

again. Old textbooks are discontinued and new ones published. Some project recommendations are implemented and others ignored. The portrayal in the textbooks of old issues between the two countries are resolved and the portrayal of new ones is unsatisfactory.

VII. Conclusion

What has been described in this paper is a cooperative, bilateral textbook study. Beyond finding a country which is interested in cooperating in such a venture, the necessary ingredients are clear - experts, time, money, textbooks, translators, and a basic support staff. Those all seem to be straightforward, but why bother? The ratio of disadvantages to advantages is seven to three! And the disadvantages are not just minor irritants to the smooth progress of such a textbook study; some of them are formidable!

It is worthwhile to bother with a textbook study such as this one! Those three subtle advantages speak overwhelmingly of process, and process is the key to the value of this kind of study. Because numerous people and organizations of both countries are involved in the whole process, they have ownership of the results and are more willing to create change by implementing some of the study recommendations. Because the experts of both countries are involved in the meeting processes of textbook criticism and rebuttal, mutual exchange of scholarship, and personal cross-cultural experiences in the other country, they are more likely to understand the perspectives of the cooperating experts and the context for their textbooks. They are, therefore, more likely to alter their own professional views in accordance with the criticisms and scholarship of the experts from the other

country. Because members of both teams are involved in extensive, and often intensive, interaction - verbal and written, personal and professional - with each other, they are more likely to be able to see the "other side" in ways different than the existing stereotypes, to be able to hear more openmindedly, and to be more willing to change themselves.

Only when these advisors and experts change themselves will the textbooks that they write, publish, promote, and teach from be changed. And change in the textbooks is the bottom line! Howard Mehlinger, director of the US/USSR Textbook Study Project, wrote in the conclusion of the Interim Report (1981, p. 171):

> But if the American and Soviet teams were not always "perfectly agreed," they did proceed from a common basis of sentiment. They launched the project with the shared belief that textbooks are important because what children are taught about their own country, about other countries, and about the relationships between countries can ultimately affect the international behavior of nations.

Appendix A

Lists of Soviet and American Team Members

(1986 - present)

U.S.S.R. Delegation

Grigoriy Nikolaevich Sevastianov
Delegation Leader
Chief of the American and Canadian Division
Institute of World History
USSR Academy of Sciences

Vladimir Pavlovich Maksakovsky
Deputy Leader, Soviet Delegation Chief
Economic Geography Department
Moscow Pedagogical Institute

Viktor Konstaninovich Furyaev
Chief
World History Department
Herzen Pedagogical Institute

Galli Vasilevna Klokova
Acting Chief
Laboratory for the Teaching of History
USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences

Svetlana Pavlovna Orlova
Senior Consultant
Foreign Department
USSR Ministry of Education

Vitol Yakovlevich Rom
Instructor
Economic Geography Department
Moscow Pedagogical Institute

Andrei Nikolayevich Sakharov
Deputy Director
Institute of History
USSR Academy of Sciences

Leonid Viktorovich Smirnyagin
Instructor
Geography Department
Moscow State University

Vladislav Martinovich Zubok
Research Fellow
USA-Canada Institute
USSR Academy of Sciences

U.S. Delegation

Howard Mehlinger
American Director
US/USSR Textbook Study Project
Dean, School of Education
Professor of Russian History
Indiana University
Education Building 233
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Ben Eklof
Associate Professor of Russian History
Indiana University
Box 1396 Goucher College
Towson, Maryland 21204

Barbara G. Flynn
Editorial Vice President
Social Studies/Foreign Languages
Scott, Foresman and Company
1900 East Lake Avenue
Glenview, Illinois 60025

Herbert J. Grover
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Wisconsin
Department of Education
125 South Webster
Post Office Box 7841
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

James H. Madison
Associate Professor of History
Indiana University-Bloomington
742 Ballantine Hall
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

James T. Patterson
Professor of History
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Joseph P. Stoltman
Professor of Geography
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-3899

Janet Vaillant
Associate Director
Soviet and East European Language and Area Center
Harvard University
1737 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Textbook Reviewers

Jack Thompson
Associate Director
US/USSR Textbook Study Project
AWC/DFN
Maxwell AFB
Alabama 36112

George Juergens
Professor of History
Indiana University
733 Ballantine Hall
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Joseph P. Stoltmen
Professor of Geography
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-3899

Appendix B

Lists of Textbooks Exchanged

(1986 - present)

List of Soviet Textbooks

1. Yefimov, A.V. (1985). Modern History, Part I. (22nd edition). Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (8th class).

2. Khvostov, V.M. (ed.). (1985). Modern History, Part II. (22nd edition). Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (9th class).

3. Furaev, V.K. (ed.). (1983). Contemporary History (1917-1939). (14th edition). Moscow: Education Publishers. (10th class).

4. Furaev, V.K. (ed.). (1985). Contemporary History (1939-1984). (15th edition). Moscow: Education Publishers. (10th class).

5. Korablev, Y.I., Y.S. Kukushkin, I.A. Fedosov, and B.P. Sherstobitov. (1986). History of the USSR. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (9th class).

6. Esakov, V.D., Y.S. Kukushkin, and A.P. Nenarokov. (1986). History of the USSR. (2nd edition). Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (10th class).

7. Korinskaia, V.A., L.D. Prozorov, and V.A. Schastnev. (1985). Geography of the Continents. (16th edition). Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (6th class).

8. Maksakovski, V.P. (ed.). (1986). Economic Geography of Foreign Countries. (11th edition). Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (9th class).

List of American Textbooks

TAE = Teacher's Annotated Edition (including Student's Edition)
SE = Student's Edition
TM = Teacher's Manual

Grade 7 World Geography/World Studies

1. Bednarz/Bednarz. (1982). World Views. Riverside Press. (TAE)
2. Drummond/Drummond. (1986). People on Earth: A World Geography. Scott Foresman. (TAE)
3. Jarolimek. (1987). World Neighbors. Macmillan. (TAE)
4. Patton/Kengert/Saveland/Cooper/Caro. (1985). A World View. Silver Burdett. (TAE)
5. Tiegs/Adams. (1983). The Earth: Geography and Culture. Ginn. (TAE)

Grade 9/10 World Geography

1. Backler/Lazarus. (1986). World Geography. McDougal, Littell. (SE+TM)
2. Gritzner. (1987). World Geography. Heath. (TAE)
3. Gross. (1986). World Geography. Allyn and Bacon. (TAE)
4. Helgren/Sager/Israel. (1985). World Geography Today. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. (TAE)
5. Hunkins/Armstrong. (1984). World Geography: People and Places. Merrill. (TAE)

Grade 10 World History

1. Beers. (1986). World History: Patterns of Civilization. Prentice-Hall. (TAE)
2. Perry. (1985). A History of the World. Houghton Mifflin. (SE+TM)
3. Smart/Kownslar. (1987). World History: A Story of Progress. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (TAE)
4. Wallbank/Schrier/Maier/Gutierrez-Smith. (1987). History and Life: The World and Its People. Scott Foresman. (TAE)
5. Welty. (1985). The Human Expression: A History of the World. Scribner, Macmillan. (SE+TM)

Grade 8 American History

1. Brown/Bass. (1985). One Flag, One Land. Silver Burdett. (TAE)

2. Buggey/Danzer/Mitsakos/Risinger. (1987). America! America!. Scott Foresman. (TAE)

3. Maier. (1986). The American People: A History. Heath. (TAE)

4. Patrick/Berkin. (1987). History of the American Nation. Macmillan. (SE+TM(1984))

5. Wilder/Ludlum/Brown. (1986). This is America's Story. Houghton Mifflin. (TAE)

Grade 11 American History

1. Berkin/Wood. (1987). Land of Promise. Scott Foresman. (TAE)

2. Boorstin/Kelley. (1986). A History of the United States. Ginn. (SE+TM)

3. Graff. (1985). America: The Glorious Republic. Houghton Mifflin. (SE+TM)

4. Risjord. (1986). History of the American People. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (TAE)

5. Todd/Curti. (1986). Triumph of the American Nation. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (TAE)

References

Hutton, D.S. and Mehlinger, H.D. (1987). International textbook revision: examples from the United States. In V.R. Berghahn and H. Schissler (eds.). Perceptions of History: International Textbook Research on Britain, Germany and the United States. New York: Berg, 141-156.

Mehlinger, H.D. (1981, June). Interim Report (US/USSR Textbook Study Project). Bloomington, Indiana: Social Studies Development Center.